THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

December 11, 1985

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Administration of Oath of Office for new member: Neil H. Porterfield

B. Dates of next meetings: January 15, 1986 (Wednesday)

February 20, 1986 (Thursday)

March 20, 1986 (Thursday)

C. Minutes of the November 13, 1985 meeting of the Commission

II. SUBMISSION AND REVIEWS

A. National Arboretum

CFA 11/DEC/85-1, Designs for erection of columns originally on the U. S. Capitol Building within the grounds of the National Arboretum.

B. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. S.L. 86-22, 441 4th Street, N. W., Judiciary Square, preliminary designs for a new office building.

2. S.L. 86- , 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. proposed rooftop satellite dish antenna.

3. Appendix I. Review of Staff recommendations.

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 86-15, 1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. new apartment/office building, concept designs, and proposed demolition of existing apartment building.

2. O.G. 86-30, 1001 34th Street, N. W., revised conceptual designs for new office/residential structure.

3. O.G. 86-31, 3700 O Street, N. W., Georgetown University. Revisions to previously approved designs for new academic center in the middle of the campus.

4. O.G. 86-34, 3200 S Street, N. W., proposed new garden structure, design concept.

5. O.G. 86-35, 3600 M Street, N. W., rooftop additions and renovations to "The Car Barn."

6. O.G. 86-36, 3608 Reservoir Road, N. W., raze existing residence, now being used for a real estate development sales office.

7. Appendix II. Review of Old Georgetown Board recommendations.

C. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

CFA 11/DEC/85-2, Lady Bird Johnson Medal, resubmission. Plaster model of obverse and four new designs for reverse.

D. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 11/DEC/85-3, Market Square retail/office/residential project, 8th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., concept designs.

Freer Gallery of Art

Object for acquisition, December 26, 1985: see note, page 13 of minutes.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 85-287	3269 M Street, N. W. Players of Georgetown	Storefront renovation

ACTION: Recommend additional study retaining more of the existing features and character of the building. Designs, as proposed for replacement of the existing shop front with a "high-tech," all-glass front, are not appropriate to the building nor the character of the historic District.

O.G. 86-11	1305 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Capital Management & Development Corporation	Addition and store renovations

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of a permit for proposed alterations, as shown on supplemental drawings received and dated 27 November 1985. The Commission notes that the design proposed incorporates a system which opens the ground floor to the sidewalk. While this seems appropriate for restaurant use, such a system may not be appropriate elsewhere. Recommend preparation of sample color panel on site for approval of Commission.

O.G. 86-18	3145 Dumbarton Street, N. W. Stacy Lloyd	Alteration to historic structure: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of applying a bay window unit as replacement for double-hung window, provided that masonry of existing opening remains undamaged to allow possible future restoration of original window. Recommend modification of proposed new stoop so that full-height railing will have only one break. Sign will be submitted under separate application.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-19	3050 P Street, N. W. Livingston Biddle	Renovations, additions and new entrance stoop: Conceptual

ACTION: General concept is not acceptable. Request retention and repair of existing stoop, utilizing wood balusters, railings, newels, treads and lattice on a masonry base. Further recommend retention of third floor decorative window grilles. In regard to the back renovations and additions, it is recommended that a new design incorporate more wood (less metal) in a scheme more complementary to the age of the existing house and more consistent in style.

O.G. 86-20	1619 35th Street, N. W. Jerome Kurtz	Renovation to back of residence

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for proposed removal of existing chimney and proposed renovation work as shown on drawings received and dated 15 November 1985.

O.G. 86-24	1054 31st Street, N. W. Canal Square Association	Loggia enclosure for new stores: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to the concept of enclosing existing loggia bays for store windows. It is understood that entrances to proposed new stores will occur off the alley and within Canal Square itself. Submit design development for review when ready.

O.G. 86-25	3047 N Street, N. W. Ditadde	Replace 2nd floor window

ACTION: Do not recommend issuance of permit based on submitted material. No objection to the concept of changing the existing window design. However, recommend that both second and third floor windows be replaced with a unified oriel window designed specifically for the existing residence.

REPORT OF ACTIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE OLD GEORGETOWN BOARD

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-26	3120 M Street, N. W. Corinne H. Martin	Alterations to building

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of a permit for renovations to commercial building as shown on drawings received and dated 29 November 1985. Approval applies to sign as submitted.

O.G. 86-27	3415 M Street, N. W. Samuel M. Levy and John Snyder	Signs

ACTION: Do not recommend issuance of permit. Material submitted is inadequate for review. In addition, proposed signs exceed 25 square foot maximum and, in violation of permitted sign content, list services and goods.

O.G. 86-28	3106 N Street, N. W. Gerald and Ellen Sigal	Alterations to residence

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for alterations and third floor addition to rear of residence as shown on drawings received and dated 29 November 1985.

O.G. 86-29	3029 M Street, N. W. Fred Maroon	Change to approved sign

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit which supersedes previously approved sign for same location. Present sign will have neon back-lighted, painted aluminum letters mounted to wood panel and attached to storefront cornice as shown on drawings received and dated 27 November 1985.

REPORT OF ACTIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE OLD GEORGETOWN BOARD

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-32	1323-25 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Samuel Snyder and John Snyder	New awning cover

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of a permit to recover existing metal awning structure with new rust-colored canvas. Applicant has agreed to incorporate sign text onto straight-line valance.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

11 December 1985

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Carolyn Deaver Hon. Roy M. Goodman Hon. Frederick E. Hart Hon. Neil H. Porterfield Hon. Pascal Regan Hon. Diane Wolf
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. Robert Cousins
D.C. Historic Preservation Board staff present:	Mrs. Tanya Beauchamp

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Administration of oath of office for new member, Neil H. Porterfield. The oath was administered by the Secretary, and Mr. Porterfield was welcomed to the Commission by the Chairman and the other members.

B. Dates of next meetings. The dates for the next four meetings were set as follows: 15 January 1986 (Wednesday), 21 February 1986 (Friday), 13 March 1986 (Thursday), and 17 April (Thursday). With the exception of the January meeting, these dates varied from those on the printed agenda.

C. Minutes of the 13 November 1985 meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts. These will be approved in January 1986.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Arboretum

CFA 11/DEC/85-1, Designs for erection of columns originally on the U. S. Capitol building within the grounds of the National Arboretum. Staff member Jeffrey Carson recalled that the east front of the Capitol, the original location of these columns, had been designed by Latrobe and erected by Bulfinch, beginning in 1818. He said that when the east front was extended during the late 1950's the columns were taken down and had been in storage ever since. He noted that they were sandstone, similar to the stone used on the White House, and about 30 feet in height. Mr. Carson then introduced Mr. Russell Hanna from EDAW, landscape architects, to carry on the discussion. Mr. Hanna first introduced those present who were involved with the project, including Dr. Henry M. Cathey, director of the Arboretum, William Ensign from the Architect of the Capitol's office, Mrs. Betty Lay from the Friends of the Arboretum, Patricia Fox from EDAW, and Mrs. Ethel Garrett, who had conceived the idea of using the columns in the Arboretum and worked for many years to make the project a reality. Mr. Hanna noted that the columns had been transferred from the jurisdication of the Architect of the Capitol's office to the Agriculture Department in 1984. He said the original design had been the work of the late Russell Page, an English landscape gardener, and he showed the members some of Mr. Page's drawings. The columns, with no entablature, were grouped on a grassy knoll, in the manner of a Classical ruin. There was a reflecting pool below and a Moorish water feature; the water had its source in a small pool within the column area and ran in a trough down the knoll and into the reflecting pool. Mr. Hanna pointed out the plantings in the column area and said they would be Mediterranean varieties, predominantly grey-green in color. He noted that Mr. Page's drawings had been only conceptual, and that in translating them into a workable solution, some changes had been made; notably, the stairs at the outer ends of the column arrangement had been moved to the center and would now flank the water trough.

Mr. Hanna showed slides of the columns and other fragments from the east front of the Capitol, including the marble steps. He said the columns would be preserved, but not restored to their original condition. The remaining fragments would be used for paving in the column and pool area. He then showed slides of the site and its surroundings, including Mount Hamilton and the Arboretum's herb garden. Mrs. Garrett commented that she had originally proposed Mount Hamilton as the site, but Mr. Page said there was no suitable location there and suggested the knoll near the herb garden instead. Mr. Hanna showed

the members a site plan, noting that 22 of the original columns would be used. He said the shafts of two of the columns had been broken; the remains of one of these columns had been put on display at the Capitol and the base and capital of the other would be used at the Arboretum, set up along the ellipse road on axis with the column arrangement. He said there would be no attempt in the placing of any of the elements to relate them to Mount Hamilton or to the L'Enfant plan. He pointed out the proposed arrangement of the 22 columns, noting that it would be similar to the original arrangement on the Capitol, though with a slightly wider column spacing because of the missing columns; he added that this spacing would also facilitate movement through the area. He said each column would have a dedication inscription beside it, and a large slab (one of the old fragments) with a descriptive legend would be set into the pavement between the two projecting columns in front. In answer to a question from Mr. Porterfield, Mr. Hanna said the approximate depth from the front edge of the reflecting pool to the back of the colonnade would be 120 feet; the height of the columns was given as 34 feet.

The members were generally pleased with the design and the siting for the column arrangement, though there was some uncertainty about the appropriateness of the Moorish water feature. Most of the questions concerned the grading required, particularly for the reflecting pool. The Chairman asked Mr. Hanna if the grading could be less formal, and Mr. Porterfield expressed his fear that a major reshaping of the natural mound might result from the construction of the pool, which he saw as a horizontal, sculptural element imposed on a natural setting. He said there were some strong elements being proposed for the site--it would not be just a Classical ruin on a hillock--and the grading details would be very important. Mr. Hanna said the pool would be low enough so that it would not be seen from a distance, and he stressed that it would be a true reflecting pool, with the columns visible in their entirety, both vertically and horizontally. Mr. Goodman asked if there would be parking associated with the project; Mr. Hanna said there would be a small parking area behind the columns, off the encircling road. Mr. Porterfield said he was still concerned that too much architecture was being proposed and that it could detract from the concept of an arboretum as a place for growing trees.

At this point Dr. Cathey asked to comment. He said it was common in an arboretum to find at least one architectural element, usually with a historial focus, and he thought the Capitol columns were ideal in this situation. He said the project was not conceived as a memorial; the pool was added because it was thought that its reflective properties would add greatly to the experience. He thought the columns would bring many people to the Arboretum who would learn something about history and also about the Arboretum and its public education programs, an important part of its function. He said he could assure the members that nothing else would ever intrude on

the meadow's 40 acres of greenspace. He added that there was a master plan for the Arboretum and he would bring it to the Commission at a later date. Mr. Porterfield thanked Dr. Cathey for his comments and said they had been helpful. He said he thought a better assessment could be made when the grading plans were ready, and he thought that with care it would be possible to fit the elements in without undue disruption of the natural setting. Miss Wolf commented on the site inspection she and Mr. Hart had taken the day before, and praised the concept. Exhibit A (site inspection itinerary)

The Chairman commented on the axial placement of the column base and capital, suggesting that other locations might be tried out and stressing that the axial relationship with the column grouping should not be played up too strongly; he thought a Romantic, rather than Classical viewpoint should dominate in this setting. Mr. Hart said he was enthusiastic about the project and thought it would bring a nice focus to the Arboretum. The other members agreed and gave conceptual approval to the design, though it was stressed they would want to see grading plans and other details when ready. The Chairman thanked Mrs. Garrett for coming and praised her for her interest and staying power in seeing this project through. Exhibit B

B. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. S.L. 86-22, 441 4th Street, N.W., Judiciary Square, preliminary designs for a new office building. Mr. Carson described the site for this project, between 3rd and 4th Streets in the Judiciary Square area, with the Tax Court to the east, the Pension Building to the north, and the Municipal Building to the south. He said it would occupy the entire block and would be 120 feet high. He noted also that there was a Metro station entrance near the southwest corner of the site. Mr. Carson then introduced architect Vlastimil Koubek to discuss his design.

Mr. Koubek first pointed out Judiciary Square on an aerial map and talked about the master plan for this historic area. He said new buildings on the east and west sides of the square had to be set back 40 feet; he pointed out several recently built office buildings and described them as medium to high-rise. He said his building would have a 90 foot cornice line facing the square and then rise to 120 feet after a 30 foot setback. He said there had been an effort to break up the considerable length by projections and recesses, and an attempt to lessen the apparent height by using a slanted, mansard type copper roof structure to conceal mechanical equipment. He said there would be some retail behind an arcade facing the square,

and the required 40 foot setback would be landscaped. He told the members that the project was presently before the zoning commission with a PUD application to increase the density by about 10%; he said this request was made because of the extra cost and loss of space resulting from the presence of the Metro station. He said that if the request were not granted, the footprint of the building would decrease only a couple of feet in each direction.

Miss Wolf asked Mr. Koubek if he thought the building would fit in with its surroundings and if it had been designed with the requirements of the Shipstead-Luce Act in mind. He answered yes to both questions, citing its light color, limestone and copper trim, and the 40 foot landscaped setback. The Chairman observed that the elevation drawings made the building appear more massive than it would in reality, that they gave no sense of the setback or the articulation of the facades. Mr. Koubek pointed out also that from the square the taller section beyond the 90 foot cornice line would not be seen. Miss Wolf said that she realized that Washington was a bureaucratic city, a city of office buildings, but she thought it was also a very beautiful city, and she would like to see a less massive, more distinguished building on this important site. Mr. Koubek replied that this was the last site in the Judiciary Square area, that the building would have to exist in an already built environment of similar office buildings surrounding the historic municipal buildings, and he did not think an architect could "do his own thing" in this situation; he thought a highly individualistic building on this site might actually detract from the beauty of Judiciary Square. Mr. Hart noted that all the great buildings of Washington were enriched with public art of some kind, and he thought this one should be, too. Mr. Koubek said he thought the landscaping in front would soften the mass, and he said the inclusion of art would certainly be considered. Peter Schwartz, the developer, asked to comment. He said the site had been empty for a long time and there had been very little interest in it after the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the D. C. Government had both dropped plans for development. He noted that the location was not the best, there was only a limited demand for retail space, and it was an expensive site to build on because of the Metro station. He said any building on this site would have to align with the others on the square and could not be a focal point.

Mr. Porterfield then questioned Mr. Koubek about the arcade along the Judiciary Square frontage, asking what was behind it. Mr. Koubek said there would be retail shops in this location, and in response to Mr. Porterfield's comment that such arcades are generally dark and tend to collect trash, said this one would be two stories in height and would face west, so he did not think there would be a problem with light. He added that it was also

designed to give cover and accommodate the subway escalators in this area. Mr. Porterfield agreed these reasons were valid ones, but he thought the ground floor area could be restudied in an effort to produce a unified public space, from the setback area to the point where the building begins. He added that he would prefer that the increase in FAR not be granted because even a foot's difference in building size would affect the landscaping possibilities.

Mrs. Regan said she was not happy with the prominent mansard roof form for the penthouse, but the Chairman said it did have the virtue of providing uniformity and concealing the mechanical equipment. He said he was not as displeased with the design as were some of the other members. He noted that the building was not really on a square, that it did not require a "great" building, and that the amenity of open space in the square precinct would prevent the size and density of this building from becoming a threat. Mr. Koubek said he thought his building did have special qualities and would be respectful of its neighbors. He said the design was only in the conceptual stage, and in response to Mr. Hart's request for public art, said there would be embellishment of this kind in the project. He recalled his record in incorporating sculpture in previous projects, citing, among others, that the noted sculptor, Louise Nevelson, had been commissioned to do a large piece for one of his recent office buildings. The Chairman told Mr. Koubek that no approval could be granted at this time but asked him to consider the suggestions made and come back with a revised design. Exhibit C, C-1

2. S.L. 86- , 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., proposed rooftop satellite dish antenna. This project was temporarily withdrawn.

3. Appendix I. Review of staff recommendations. There were no objections and the recommendations were approved.

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 86-15, 1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.; new apartment/office building, concept designs, and proposed demolition of existing apartment building. Before discussing this project the Assistant Secretary introduced Peter Vercelli, member of the Georgetown Board, to the members. Turning to this submission, the Assistant Secretary said the existing building and its possible demolition had been considered once before (1978) by the Commission. Aside from the fact that it was a non-obtrusive building, set back from the street, the members felt that it had no historic or architectural merit and approved a demolition permit with the request that they see the new design

for the site. The permit was not acted upon and the proposal for a new building fell through. He said the same developer with a different architect was again proposing to raze the building and build a new one that would extend 19 feet closer to Wisconsin Avenue, though parts of the terracing and hill would be retained, especially to the south. He noted for the record that Mrs. Kohler had checked building permits for the existing building and found that the original permit dated from December 1914 and that the building had been altered in 1934 and again in 1952; it was in the latter year that the Colonial details had been added.

The Assistant Secretary noted that Miss Wolf and Mr. Hart had seen the site on their tour the day preceding the meeting. Both indicated that they had no special feeling for the existing building, but did think the rock outcroppings should be retained because of their recall of historic Georgetown. The Assistant Secretary, referring to the Georgetown Board's report in the members' folders, said the Board had seen the project twice, recommending after the first review that the bulk and character be restudied in relation to the hillside and the small structures to the north; a modified design was submitted, and other than several specific recommendations concerning architectural detailing and type of planting, it was now recommending approval for design development. Board member Peter Vercelli commented on the design, saying that, personally, he was not sure the canted roof element really belonged in this location, where the rest of the roofs were flat; he thought perhaps a decorative element would contribute more to adding interest to the building. He added that he thought a controlled landscape treatment of the hillside would be preferable to keeping the old rock outcroppings. The developer, Peter Schwartz, then commented on the work he had been doing over the past three years: achieving an alley closing agreement with the Dodge Center, an agreement with the adjacent condominium owners regarding a covenant requiring a setback from them, and an agreement to terrace back from the neighbors to the north. Shalom Baranes, the architect, then discussed further aspects of the design. He said the building would still be set back from Wisconsin Avenue 10 feet, further than most structures on the block. He introduced Bryant Stevenson, the landscape architect who would be working on developing the terraced hillside and its plantings, and pointed out an existing rubble wall that would be retained. The entrance would be to the north, through a gate in the wall and into a small entrance courtyard. Mr. Baranes said the changing scale from the large Dodge Center to the small residences to the north had been dealt with by the use of a tower element at the south corner. The upper floor would be set back 5 feet and dormers set in a canted roof on the north. Miss Wolf said she agreed with Mr. Vercelli on the inappropriateness of this type of roof. Mr. Baranes said he had used the dormers to give some articulation to the roof on this elevation. Mr. Porterfield said

a large tree on the north corner would help the discrepancy in scale, and, in fact, another one on the south would close in the gap at the Dodge Center and help anchor that corner of the project. With these comments, the members agreed with the Georgetown Board's recommendation and approved the project for design development.

Exhibit C

2. O.G. 86-30, 1001 34th Street, N.W., revised conceptual designs for new office/residential structure. Mr. Carson gave the members background information on this project, saying that the Georgetown Board had first seen it in June, objected to its bulk and the character of the design, and then had seen a revised version on 3 December. This time there had been objections to the extreme differences in the design of the front and rear, and especially to the unsuitability of the monumental civic character of the Water Street facade with its curved entrance bay. The design of the penthouse had also been criticized because it ran at 90° to the major interior circulation. Mr. Vercelli was introduced to explain further the Board's reactions. Commenting on the penthouse structure, he said the Board felt that by turning it 90° it would help tie together the two residential sections, located at the east and west ends. He noted, too, that the fenestration of the building was confusing; it consisted of a combination of very large, industrial-type glazing, sometimes extending several stories, and the traditional punched window; both types were used in the residential as well as the office sections. Thirdly, he talked about the major facades, noting that this would be the only building where the full facade stretched out along the canal. He found this overpowering, and criticized, too, the disparity between this and the Water Street facade. The latter facade he found totally uncharacteristic of Georgetown.

Tom McDuffy, from the architectural firm of Clark, Tribble, Harris and Li, was then introduced. He said he felt the building had a loft-type, industrial character, suitable for the waterfront, and noted that the FAR was far below that allowed. He pointed out two levels of above-ground parking on the Water Street facade, and in the rear, noted a 15 foot National Park Service easement along the canal. He said that since the last review by the Board, the fenestration of the Water Street facade had been changed to comply with their recommendations and showed the members what had been done. Jack Benjamin from the Park Service was then asked to discuss his agency's concerns. He said their main problem with the design was that it was too heavy as it faced the canal; he thought setting it back would help. He said the 15 foot easement had been placed in this area because a realignment of the canal was planned; fill placed in this section in 1952 would be removed.

The members then discussed the design. The Chairman said he

thought it made an overbearing statement on both sides. He objected to the strong civic character of the building with residential units just added on. Mr. Porterfield agreed, saying it looked more like a post office than the warehouse or loft-type space described by the architects. Mr. Hart objected to the view from across the river, saying it would be far too monumental. He thought that, in general, the building did not take advantage of its setting. In summary, the Chairman said this was the wrong building for this site, that it should be more relaxed and not so obtrusive. The conceptual design was unanimously disapproved. Exhibits C, C-2

3. O.G. 86-31, 3700 O Street, N.W., Georgetown University. Revisions to previously approved designs for new academic center in the middle of the campus. The Assistant Secretary told the members that this was potentially one of the largest structures in Georgetown. He said it would consist of three terraces on the hillside behind the Medical Center, in the middle of the campus. He showed an aerial photograph and noted the beginning of construction. He said both the Georgetown Board and the Commission had been reviewing various phases of the project over a period of years. This submission, he said, was for review of facade designs for the aboveground structures on the first terrace. He noted the presence at the meeting of Dean Price and Thomas Stohlman from the university, Theodore Mariani from the architectural firm of Mariani & Associates, and Tony Cicci from the same firm. Mr. Cicci showed slides of the model and drawings of the proposed construction: a four story office structure and a guest facility of the same height, a theatre and a one story student center, all arranged around a landscaped court. Mr. Cicci pointed out changes that had been made: the east entry bridge was smaller, the office and guest facilities had been reduced in size also, and there had been refinements in the design of the theatre--a breaking down of the mass of the stage area. Then Mr. Cicci showed slides of the red brick rear facade of the university's 19th century building, Healy Hall, pointing out elements that had been picked up in the new buildings. He said the design and materials of the parking structure below the facilities previously mentioned had been played down; he noted also that it would not be visible when the second deck was built. Mr. Hart asked if the garage lighting would be seen from across the river. Mr. Mariani said it might be, but observed that the level of lighting in the parking area would be much lower than in the student center buildings and so would tend to fade from view. The members had no further questions, were pleased with the design, and unanimously approved the revisions. Exhibit C

4. O.G. 86-34, 3200 S Street, N.W., proposed new garden structure, design concept. Mr. Carson showed a model of a proposed

Japanese-style pavilion, set between two existing octagonal garden structures of Classical design with bell-shaped roofs. The windows in the existing structures would be replaced with shoji to tie in with the new pavilion. While the members were not sure the window substitution was a good idea, and the Japanese pavilion was certainly not characteristic of Georgetown, some members found the project had a certain charm, and they realized that none of the structures would really be visible from public space; therefore, they followed the Georgetown Board's recommendation and posed no objection to approval. Exhibit C

5. O.G. 86-35, 3600 M Street, N.W., rooftop additions and renovations to "The Car Barn". Mr. Carson located this project, near the Georgetown end of Key Bridge, and said the Commission had seen preliminary designs in July. At that time the recommendation was that the roof additions be more in the spirit of the original building of 1895, rather than the more severe 1911 remodeling. He showed an old model of the project and revised drawings, and then introduced architect Arthur Cotton Moore. Mr. Moore showed the members a photograph of the original structure and then his new drawings, pointing out the more vigorous design of the dormers, in line with the Commission's recommendations. He said the dormers would come out to the walls, that the pitch of the roof had been raised, and that the roof material would be tile, like that on the old building; he also pointed out other design elements picked up from the original design. When asked by Mr. Hart about the kind of hardware that would be used, Mr. Moore replied that it would be in character for the period. He showed drawings of the proposed garden on the roof and noted that traditional Washington globes would be used for lighting. Mr. Carson noted that details--lighting, hardware, materials--would be seen at a later date. Mr. Vercelli reported that the Georgetown Board was satisfied with the revisions, and the Commission unanimously approved the project for design development. Exhibit C

6. O.G. 86-36, 3608 Reservoir Road, N.W., raze existing residence, now being used for a real estate development office. The Assistant Secretary showed photographs of the house before it had been painted and altered for use as a sales office. He said Mrs. Kohler's research had revealed that it had been built as a caretaker's house by the architectural firm of Hill and Kendall in 1906. James G. Hill was a prominent architect, formerly Supervising Architect of the Treasury. The Assistant Secretary said that in 1979 the Commission had approved razing the house as part of the master plan approval for the project, which has been under construction since then. He reported that Miss Wolf and Mr. Hart had seen the house on their pre-meeting tour and had no objections to

its being razed. The other members agreed that under the circumstances the demolition should not be opposed. Mrs. Tanya Beauchamp, representing the D. C. Historic Preservation Board, said that board would review the case, and if the demolition were not approved, the applicant would have the option of requesting a public hearing, claiming economic hardship or special merit for the project. Exhibit C

7. Appendix II. Review of Old Georgetown Board recommendations. There were no objections and the recommendations were approved.

C. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

CFA 11/DEC/85-2, Lady Bird Johnson Medal, resubmission; Plaster model of obverse and four new designs for reverse. Mrs. Kohler recalled that the members had seen a plaster model for the portrait of Mrs. Johnson at the previous meeting and had recommended revisions to the mouth to produce a better likeness and a less stern appearance. She introduced George Schafer from the Mint to show them a revised version. They felt there had been no improvement, and Mr. Hart said he thought the main difficulty lay in the fact that the artist was restricted to using one photograph (of a painting) as a model. It was suggested that a number of different photographs be used as sources, keeping in mind the general feeling of the portrait preferred by Mrs. Johnson. Mr. Hart suggested that an artist from outside the Mint be hired to prepare a new design.

Mr. Schafer then showed four new designs for the reverse. Mrs. Kohler told the new members that the Commission had rejected the original design, a view of the Johnson ranch, because it was too pictorial and had too many elements to be effective when reduced to medal size. One of the new designs used only a small section of the original design, but it, too, was considered unintelligible when reduced. The other three used wildflowers as a theme, one using only a single bluebonnet. The members thought the concept of using a single flower was a good one, but they thought the choice was poor; Miss Wolf observed that it looked more like a tree when reduced in size. It was suggested that a plant whose flowers did not grow in clusters and one with a more open petal structure would be a better choice. Miss Wolf suggested that a suitable design might be found among the state flowers shown on the Johnson White House china.

The designs for both sides of the medal were again disapproved; Mr. Schafer was asked to take the suggestions made back to the Mint and consult with the staff if design questions arose before the next meeting.

D. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 11/DEC/85-3, Market Square retail/office/residential project, 8th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., concept designs. The Assistant Secretary introduced James Rich from PADC to give the new members a brief

history of the recent development of the Market Square area--the Navy Memorial, public park, and now the private development surrounding them. He said the design for the private buildings had been the result of a competition won by local architects, Hartman & Cox. It would be a mixed-use development with retail at grade, offices in the main body of the building, and residential on top. He noted the semicircular configuration, conforming to the shape of the memorial area, and the Classical style of architecture, complementing the Archives building across the avenue. Mr. Rich then introduced architect George Hartman to carry on the discussion.

Mr. Hartman showed slides, including a map of this part of Pennsylvania Avenue, and discussed the variations in a radial avenue at the points where the grid streets intersect and how these affect the siting of buildings. He pointed out the 8th Street axis, on which the Navy Memorial is located, and noted that it was a feature of L'Enfant's plan, though it was broken by the erection of the Archives building. He said that because of the peculiarities of the grid plus radial street system, his project will come sharply forward from the FBI building but will set back from the open space at Indiana Plaza. He compared the size of the Market Square space to that of the Great Plaza of the Federal Triangle and noted that both spaces ended in a curved colonnade, though in the case of his building it would be an interrupted one to preserve the 8th Street axis and view from the Archives portico to that of the Portrait Gallery north on F Street. He pointed out the discrepancy in the Archives-Portrait Gallery axis and described his various attempts to deal with this. At one point he had tried narrowing the vista, and then the PADC staff conceived the idea of splaying the buildings to make the axis work; he said he was proceeding on this basis and thought it would be successful. He then described the use of Classical elements on the building, particularly the multi-story colonnade, similar to the Federal Triangle buildings, but with a lighter, metal curtain wall fenestration behind the columns. He noted that the pediments had been removed from the original competition design, and that there had been a redesign of the residential floors, with the addition of loggias making them more open in feeling. The side street facades would have a commercial character, while the service functions would be grouped along D Street. Entrance to the residential floors would be from 8th Street.

Mr. Hart asked if any artistic embellishment, in the manner of the Federal Triangle, was being planned for these buildings. Mr. Hartman introduced a representative from the developer to answer that question. The representative did not indicate that any part of the budget had been set aside for such embellishments, but did say that the detailing of the retail area and street items would be of the highest quality. Mr. Hart said he thought that since the developer was taking advantage of the public park and memorial in front of his buildings he should return the favor by providing some amenities in the form of public art. Mr. Hartman said he would be interested in this and the developer's representative said they would consider it. Mr. Rich pointed out the fact that there would be relief and free-standing sculpture in connection with the Navy Memorial.

In conclusion, the Chairman said he and the other members were very pleased with the conceptual design; Mr. Hartman was congratulated and the design unanimously approved. Exhibit D

The meeting was adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Note: On December 26, 1985 the Chairman inspected and approved, acting for the other members of the Commission, an object for acquisition by the Freer Gallery of Art. Exhibit E

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A

INSPECTION TOUR

Tuesday - December 10, 1985

10:00 A.M.

National Arboretum	Placement of old east front - U. S. Capitol columns
Judiciary Square 441 4th Street	New office building
Market Square Development 8th and Pennsylvania Avenue N. W.	New office and residential building

GEORGETOWN

Cherry Hill Apartments 1024 Wisconsin Avenue	New office-residential building
1001 34th Street Between Canal and Water Street	New office and residential building
3600 'M' Street	Revised design for rooftop Addition to Old Car Barn
3700 'O' Street Georgetown University	Phase 1 of new academic center - Revised design
3608 Reservoir Road	Raze existing residence - now being used for real estate office
3200 'S' Street	New garden pavillion

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT B

January 3, 1986

Dear Dr. Cathey:

The Commission was pleased to meet with you, Mrs. Ethel Garrett and the project designer for EDAW, Russ Hanna, on 11 December 1985 to discuss plans for the erection at the Arboretum of twenty-two of the columns originally belonging to the East Front of the Capitol Building. The Commission is delighted by the concept and is in full support of the site which in every sense is a natural pedestal for the columns. The members also generally approve of the reflective water element, but caution that care be taken to ensure that the columns will be reflected in the water as intended and that the formal pool will not appear out of place in the natural greensward of the meadow.

This brings to mind several potential problems. Whereas the idea of a reflecting body of water is dramatic, the additional 'Moorish' water course might prove too distracting and incidental to secure the overall best effect. This will need careful thought. In regard to the ground plane or base for the columns, we are of the opinion that the very notion of the project and its location are together a strongly romantic statement. Therefore, it seems imperative that the column platform and surrounding terrain be handled in such a way as to appear natural, almost inevitable, avoiding geometric berming at either end.

The Commission looks forward to working with you and the architects toward achieving the best conclusion to this important addition to the Arboretum.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown

Dr. Henry M. Cathey, Director
U. S. National Arboretum
3501 New York Avenue, N. E.
Washington, D. C. 20002

OLD GEORGETOWN AND SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACTIONS
Re: Items of the December 11, 1985
Meeting Agenda

EXHIBIT C

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-15	1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. PNGS Companies	New building

ACTION: Concept is approved for design development subject to restudy of roof designs and landscape plans and contingent on matter-of-right zoning with no excess height allowances. Resubmit design development drawings for review and approval of the Commission of Fine Arts prior to submission of working drawings. Additional roof study should eliminate some of the mansart effect and the dormers on the north party wall. More substantial cornice designs and additional set-backs should be considered. Landscape study should include a large tree mass at the southeast corner of the site and draping the retaining walls with climbing plants. Submit material samples of brick, trim, and window sash elements.

O.G. 86-31	3700 O Street, N. W. Georgetown University	Georgetown University Center

ACTION: Revised concept designs are approved subject to submission, review and approval of working drawings and material samples. This action relates only to the 'Leavey Center' proposed for the existing deck structure. It is understood that the specific theater design will be subject to and included with CFA review of the next phase of the University Center, as will subsequent deck structures and the details of the "bridge" connection to the campus.

O.G. 86-34	3200 S Street, N. W. Catherine M. Conover	Studio-house Conceptual

ACTION: Concept is approved on the basis that proposed new structure will be mostly concealed behind existing seven foot high masonry garden wall at street. Submit final plans, material samples and landscape treatment when ready. Recommend planting of additional trees between new studio and street.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-35	3600 M Street, N. W. D. C. Realty Corporation	"The Car Barn"

ACTION: Concept design for proposed alterations, renovations, rooftop addition and garden is approved subject to detail refinement. Submit design development drawings and material samples when ready.

O.G. 86-36	3608 Reservoir Road, N. W. Porten Sullivan Corporation	Raze building

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for razing dwelling. Because of an implemented master plan for new construction on the site and because it was determined that the house had little architectural merit at the Commission's October 23, 1979 meeting, there is no objection to the proposed demolition.

S.L. 86-22	441 4th Street, N. W. Peter Schwartz	New office building

ACTION: Concept submission superseded by Shipstead-Luce case 86-60.

O.G. 86-30	1001 34th Street, N. W. Hadid Investment Group	Commercial office building w/ residential units : Conceptual

ACTION: Concept not recommended for design development. See letter to Carol Thompson dated 3 January 1986.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT C-1

January 3, 1986

Dear Ms. Thompson:

During its meeting of 11 December 1985, the Commission reviewed preliminary design drawings for a new office building at 441 4th Street, Northwest (S.L. case 86-22). The proposed structure is to occupy the vacant block bordered by 3rd, 4th, D and E Streets, just east of the Old Courthouse Building.

After careful review and discussion with the architect, Vlastimil Koubek, and the developer, Peter Schwartz, the Commission concluded that the design required additional study. While the concept goes considerably beyond the more commonplace glass box image associated with contemporary commercial office construction, the members nevertheless feel that this is an important opportunity and trust there is room for improvement. Specifically, the Commission has four recommendations: (1) effort should be made toward further reducing the overall apparent bulk or mass through greater emphasis of the terracing effects, (2) a more carefully designed penthouse and roof system would help soften the roof silhouette, (3) elements such as sculpture and murals should be considered for incorporation within the fabric of the structure, and (4) there should be a greater feeling of public access by way of the ends of the proposed arcade. In addition to this last item, it is recommended that the arcade act as a continuation of the public sidewalk and not as a barrier. This may be achieved by way of a careful landscape and pavement scheme.

As a means to more effectively present this project in the future, the Commission would greatly appreciate the inclusion of a model as well as perspective drawings and sight-line studies showing the new building as viewed from the historic structures comprising Judiciary Square.

The Commission looks forward to reviewing the progress of this design and is confident that the result will enrich the city.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Carol Thompson, Director
Department of Consumer and Regulatory
Affairs
614 H Street, N. W.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT C-2

January 3, 1986

Dear Ms. Thompson:

At its meeting on December 11, 1985 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed a conceptual design for a new combined residential-office structure proposed for the Georgetown waterfront between the C and O Canal and 'K' Street at 34th Street. As a result of our discussions, we have asked the architects to restudy the design within the framework of the following comments:

o The character of the design should be more derivative of simple loft and warehouse buildings, some of which are located immediately to the east of the site. This view coincides with that of the architect as expressed at the meeting. Unfortunately the design as proposed had overtones of a more civic-oriented building that would typically be a foreground structure sited on a more open space or at the end of a vista.

o Contributing to this character are elements such as the central semicircular bay topped by a roof structure that added more emphasis; the large scale treatment of openings, especially on the south side, which suggests similarly scaled spaces on the interior; and the formal symmetry of the massing.

o Treatment of residential and office elements as expressed on the facades should be more unified. There was a serious disparity in scale between these two elements.

o Concern was also expressed about the massing and height of the building as it relates to its frontage on the Canal. A lower profile, either achieved through setbacks or other design modulation should be considered.

The Old Georgetown Board will be meeting next on 7 January 1986 with the Commission meeting following on the 15th. We would be happy to review revised conceptual designs at that time.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Carol Thompson, Director
Department of Consumer and Regulatory
Affairs
614 H Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT D

January 3, 1986

Dear Mr. Brodie:

At its meeting on 11 December 1985, the Commission reviewed and approved concept plans for the Market Square project bordering 8th Street north of Pennsylvania Avenue. The use of a neo-classical style in the architectural solution as proposed by architects Hartman and Cox will not only form a fitting backdrop to the Navy Memorial and a frame to the Portrait Gallery, but more importantly will unify the north and south sides of the avenue, a critical element in the treatment of Market Square that up to now has been absent in other proposals. We look forward to the continued refinement of these plans.

During the discussion a question was raised regarding the integration of sculpture and other decorative elements in the architectural designs. Elements such as carved keystones, friezes, special railings, lighting and hardware are only some of the means by which this might be accomplished. Since many of the Triangle buildings are so enriched, and the Market Square project is to key stylistically on them, then it would certainly be appropriate to develop the new designs in a like manner. We were glad to hear from the architect that he is already studying this question, and we look forward to seeing the results of his efforts. It is a great opportunity to add further distinction to a design that this Commission feels has already achieved an exceptional quality overall.

The Commission looks forward to the continuing review of this project and will be happy to include it on its agenda at some future meeting.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown

Mr. James Brodie
Pennsylvania Avenue
Development Corporation
425 13th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20004

FREER GALLERY OF ART
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20560

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
DEC 31 1985

26 December 1985

EXHIBIT E

Mr. Charles Atherton
Secretary
Commission of Fine Arts
708 Jackson Place, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Dear Charles:

In the flurry that marks the end of the year, one of our curators discovered a Chinese handscroll that a donor wanted to present to us during 1985. To enable the donor to do so, I asked Carter if he would be willing to give his approval, acting for the other members of the Commission.

Enclosed is the statement, signed by Carter and Bob Adams. I apologize for this last moment action.

With best wishes for the New Year,

Yours,

Thomas Lawton,
Director

Enclosure

TELEPHONE (202) 357-2104

FINE ARTS COMMISSION

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Commission of Fine Arts, as provided in Parageaph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles Lang Freer, have examined the following:

Gift to the Collection:

1 Chinese painting; Ming dynasty (1368-1644); by Li Liu-fang; landscape and poem. Handscroll; ink on paper.

26 December 1985 — S/Robert McC. Adams
For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

26 December 1985 — S/ J. Carter Brown
For the Commission of Fine Arts

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
DEC 31 1985

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS